arXiv:1403.5510v1 [math.NT] 21 Mar 2014

Algebraic independence of reciprocal sums of certain Fibonacci-type numbers

Peter Bundschuh and Keijo Väänänen

Abstract: Let $(F_n)_{n\ge 0}$ and $(L_n)_{n\ge 0}$ denote the Fibonacci and Lucas sequences. The present work studies algebraic independence of the numbers $\sum_h b_h/F_{kr^h+\ell}, \sum_h c_h/L_{kr^h+\ell}$ ($\ell\in\mathbb{Z},\ r\in\mathbb{N}\setminus\{1\}$), where $k\in\mathbb{N}$ is fixed, $(b_h)_{h\ge 0}, (c_h)_{h\ge 0}$ are non-zero periodic sequences of algebraic numbers and the sum is taken over all integers $h\ge 0$ satisfying $kr^h+\ell>0$. Also results for more general sequences are obtained. The main tool is Mahler's method reducing the investigation of the algebraic independence of numbers (over $\mathbb{Q}$) to the one of functions (over the rational function field) if these satisfy certain types of functional equations.

Keywords: Algebraic independence of numbers, Mahler's method, algebraic independence of functions.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 11J91; 11J81, 39B32.

1 Introduction and main results

The Fibonacci sequence $(F_n)_{n\ge 0}$ and the Lucas sequence $(L_n)_{n\ge 0}$ satisfy the recurrence

$$y_{n+2}=y_n+y_{n+1}\ (n\ge 0)$$

with initial conditions $y_0=0, y_1=1$ and $y_0=2, y_1=1$, respectively. In the present paper, we are interested in the algebraic independence of the numbers

$$q_{\mu,r}:=\sum_{h=0}^{\infty}a_h\Big(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}\Big)^{-\mu kr^h},\ F_{\ell,r}:=\sum_{h=0}^{\infty}{}'\frac{b_h}{F_{kr^h+\ell}},\ L_{\ell,r}:=\sum_{h=0}^{\infty}{}'\frac{c_h}{L_{kr^h+\ell}} \tag{1}$$

$$(\ell\in\mathbb{Z},\ r\in\mathbb{N}\setminus\{1\},\ \mu=1,\dots,r-1),$$

where $k\in\mathbb{N}$ is fixed, $(a_h)_{h\ge 0}, (b_h)_{h\ge 0}$ and $(c_h)_{h\ge 0}$ are non-zero periodic sequences of algebraic numbers, and $\sum'_{h\ge 0}$ is taken over those $h\in\mathbb{N}_0$ with non-zero denominator and $kr^h+\ell\ge 0$. To present our first result, we introduce a set of positive integers

$$\mathcal{D}=\{d\in\mathbb{N}:\ d\ne a^n\ (a,n\in\mathbb{N},\ n\ge 2)\}. \tag{2}$$

Then each integer $r\ge 2$ has a unique representation in the form $r=d^j$ with $d\in\mathcal{D}, j\in\mathbb{N}$, and we define $d(r):=d$.

Theorem 1. *The numbers*

$$q_{\mu,r},\ F_{\ell,r},\ L_{\ell,r}\quad(\ell\in\mathbb{Z},\ r\in\mathbb{N}\setminus\{1\},\ \mu=1,\dots,d(r)-1) \tag{3}$$

are algebraically independent, unless (b_h) is constant. In this special case, $F_{0,2}$ is algebraic, but all other numbers in (3) are algebraically independent.

This result gives a partial generalization of many earlier results considering separately the numbers $F_{\ell,r}$ or $L_{\ell,r}$, see e.g. [1], [4], [5], [7], [8], [9] and the references there. For fixed $r \geq 3$, we refer to [2, Theorem 7].

More generally, let γ_1 and γ_2 be non-zero algebraic numbers satisfying $|\gamma_1| > 1, \gamma_1\gamma_2 = \delta = \pm 1$, and define

$$R_n := g_1\gamma_1^n + g_2\gamma_2^n,\ S_n := h_1\gamma_1^n + h_2\gamma_2^n \quad (n \in \mathbb{Z}),$$

where g_1, g_2, h_1, h_2 are non-zero algebraic numbers. Moreover, let $\Omega := (g_1h_2)/(g_2h_1)$. In particular, the special choice $(R_n) = (F_n), (S_n) = (L_n)$ yields $\Omega = -1$. Next, for fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we introduce for $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}, r \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}, \mu = 1, \ldots, r-1$ the three series

$$Q_{\mu,r} := \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_h}{\gamma_1^{\mu k r^h}},\ R_{\ell,r} := \sum_{h=0}^{\infty}{}' \frac{b_h}{R_{kr^h+\ell}},\ S_{\ell,r} := \sum_{h=0}^{\infty}{}' \frac{c_h}{S_{kr^h+\ell}}, \tag{4}$$

where $(a_h)_{h\geq 0}, (b_h)_{h\geq 0}$, and $(c_h)_{h\geq 0}$ are, as above, non-zero periodic sequences of algebraic numbers. Then we have the following generalization of Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. *If $\Omega \notin (\gamma_1/\gamma_2)^{\mathbb{Z}}$, then the numbers*

$$Q_{\mu,r},\ R_{\ell,r},\ S_{\ell,r} \quad (\ell \in \mathbb{Z}, r \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}, \mu = 1, \ldots, d(r) - 1) \tag{5}$$

are algebraically independent, unless there exists an $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying one of the following properties:
1) $R_{\ell_0} = 1$ and (b_h) is constant;
2) $S_{\ell_0} = 1$ and (c_h) is constant;
3) $(\gamma_1/\gamma_2)^{\ell_0} = -g_1^{-1}g_2\theta$ and $\Omega\theta \in (\gamma_1/\gamma_2)^{\mathbb{Z}}$, where $\theta = e^{2\pi i/3}$;
4) $(\gamma_1/\gamma_2)^{\ell_0} = -g_1^{-1}g_2\theta$ and $\Omega\theta \in (\gamma_1/\gamma_2)^{\mathbb{Z}}$, where $\theta = e^{-2\pi i/3}$.
In case 1) (or 2)), the number $R_{\ell_0,2}$ (or $S_{\ell_0,2}$, respectively) is algebraic but all other numbers in (5) are algebraically independent. In cases 3) and 4), after removing all numbers $R_{\ell_0,2^j}$ $(j \in \mathbb{N})$ from (5), the remaining numbers are algebraically independent.

Again here there are several results considering separately the numbers $R_{\ell,r}$ or $S_{\ell,r}$, and even the powers of these, see [9]. We would like to point out that also our considerations below could be generalized to prove the algebraic independence of

$$Q_{\mu,r},\ R_{\ell,r,m} := \sum_{h=0}^{\infty}{}' \frac{b_h}{(R_{kr^h+\ell})^m},\ S_{\ell,r,m} := \sum_{h=0}^{\infty}{}' \frac{c_h}{(S_{kr^h+\ell})^m}$$

$$(\ell \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in \mathbb{N}, r \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}, r \notin 2^{2\mathbb{N}-1}, \mu = 1, \ldots, d(r) - 1)\ .$$

The extra condition $r \notin 2^{2\mathbb{N}-1}$ is needed, since in the case $r = 2$ there are dependence relations with even values of m, see [3, Theorem 2 and Remark 5].

Let now α_ℓ ($\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$) be non-zero algebraic numbers satisfying $|\alpha_0| = 1, |\alpha_{\ell_1}| \neq |\alpha_{\ell_2}|$ for $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2$, and let $\beta_\ell = \delta_\ell \alpha_\ell$ with algebraic δ_ℓ such that $|\delta_\ell| = 1, \delta_\ell \neq 1$ ($\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$). In proving Theorems 1 and 2, we obtain also a result on the values of the functions

$$\Gamma_{\mu,r}(z) := \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} a_h z^{\mu r^h} \quad (\mu = 1, \dots, r-1),$$

$$\Phi_{\ell,r}(z) := \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} b_h \frac{z^{r^h}}{z^{2r^h} - \alpha_\ell}, \ \Lambda_{\ell,r}(z) := \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} c_h \frac{z^{r^h}}{z^{2r^h} - \beta_\ell} \quad (\ell \in \mathbb{Z}, r \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}).$$

Theorem 3. *Let α_ℓ, β_ℓ ($\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$) be as above. If α is an algebraic number with $0 < |\alpha| < 1$ and $\alpha^{2r^h} \neq \alpha_\ell, \beta_\ell$ for all $h \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$, then the numbers*

$$\Gamma_{\mu,r}(\alpha), \ \Phi_{\ell,r}(\alpha), \ \Lambda_{\ell,r}(\alpha) \quad (\ell \in \mathbb{Z}, \ r \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}, \ \mu = 1, \dots, d(r) - 1) \tag{6}$$

are algebraically independent, unless one of the following cases holds:
1) (b_h) is constant and $\alpha_0 = 1$;
2) (c_h) is constant and $\beta_0 = 1$;
3) $\alpha_0 = e^{2\pi i/3}$ and $\beta_0 = \alpha_0^2$;
4) $\alpha_0 = e^{-2\pi i/3}$ and $\beta_0 = \alpha_0^2$.
In case 1) (or 2)), $\Phi_{0,2}(\alpha)$ (or $\Lambda_{0,2}(\alpha)$, respectively) is algebraic, but all other numbers in (6) are algebraically independent. In case 3) (or 4)), after removing the numbers $\Phi_{0,2^j}(\alpha)$ (or $\Lambda_{0,2^j}(\alpha)$) with $j \in \mathbb{N}$ from (6) the remaining numbers are algebraically independent.

The preceding statement also applies assuming $|\alpha_0| = 1, |\alpha_{\ell_1}| \neq |\alpha_{\ell_2}|$ and $|\beta_{\ell_1}| \neq |\beta_{\ell_2}|$ for $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2$, and $|\alpha_{\ell_1}| \neq |\beta_{\ell_2}|$ for all ℓ_1, ℓ_2. Here the cases 3) and 4) cannot occur.

Finally, we note the following corollary of Theorem 3 considering the values of Fredholm-type series.

Corollary 1. *For algebraic α with $0 < |\alpha| < 1$, the numbers*

$$\Gamma_{\mu,r}(\alpha) \quad (r \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}, \mu = 1, \dots, d(r) - 1)$$

are algebraically independent.

This gives some further information on the values of series of this type, for earlier results see [6, Chapter 3] and [8, Theorem 2].

The main ideas of the proofs of our results are similar to [9]. First, in Section 2, we consider linear independence of Mahler-type functions related to our results. Here the considerations needed for the case $\Omega = \Delta(\gamma_1/\gamma_2)^{\ell_1}$ with some $\ell_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $|\Delta| = 1, \Delta \neq 1$, are most interesting and challenging, in fact the case $|\Omega| \notin |\gamma_1/\gamma_2|^{\mathbb{Z}}$ follows essentially from the studies in [9]. Then, following the lines of [9], the algebraic independence of the functions (over $\mathbb{C}(z)$) under consideration and of their values (over $\mathbb{Q}$) are proved, giving Theorem 3. In the final Section 5, the connection of the numbers in our theorems with such function values implies the validity of Theorems 1 and 2.

2 Linear independence of functions

In our first lemma, we are interested in the Mahler-type functions

$$F_i(z) := \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} a^h \frac{A_i(z^{r^h})}{B_i(z^{r^h})} \quad (i = 0, 1, \dots, m),$$

where $r \geq 2$ is an integer, $a \neq 0$ is a complex number, $A_i(z), B_i(z) \in \mathbb{C}[z] \setminus \{0\}, A_i(0) = 0, B_0(z) \equiv 1$, and, for any $i \geq 1, A_i(z)$ and $B_i(z)$ are coprime, and the $B_i(z)$ are distinct, non-constant, and monic. Clearly

$$aF_i(z^r) = F_i(z) - \frac{A_i(z)}{B_i(z)} \quad (i = 0, 1, \dots, m).$$

Lemma 1. *For each $i = 1, \dots, m$, assume that $B_i(z)$ (as above) has exactly t_i distinct zeros all of them of the same absolute value ω_i. Let all $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m$ be distinct, and $\omega_m = 1$. In case $m \geq 2$, suppose furthermore $(r-1)t_i \geq t_j$ for every pair (i, j) with $1 \leq i, j < m$. Then the function*

$$u_0F_0(z) + u_1F_1(z) + \cdots + u_mF_m(z)$$

with $(u_0, \dots, u_m) \in \mathbb{C}^{m+1}$ is rational if and only if $u_1 = \cdots = u_{m-1} = 0$ and the function $u_0F_0(z) + u_mF_m(z)$ is rational.

Proof. Clearly, we may assume $m \geq 2$ and $(u_1, \dots, u_{m-1}) \neq \underline{0}$. The function $g(z) := \sum_{i=0}^{m} u_iF_i(z)$ in our lemma satisfies the functional equation

$$ag(z^r) = g(z) - u_0A_0(z) - u_1\frac{A_1(z)}{B_1(z)} - \cdots - u_m\frac{A_m(z)}{B_m(z)}. \tag{7}$$

Assuming that $g(z)$ is rational, it must have poles of absolute value $\neq 1$, and we may first suppose of absolute value > 1. Let p be such a pole with maximal absolute value. Then $|p| = \omega_i$ with some $i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$. Clearly, p cannot be a pole of $g(z^r)$. Thus, the hypotheses of our lemma together with (7) imply that all distinct zeros of $B_i(z)$, say $\alpha_{i,1}, \dots, \alpha_{i,t_i}$, are poles of $g(z)$, hence rt_i numbers $\sqrt[r]{\alpha_{i,\nu}}$ are poles of $g(z^r)$. By the distinctness of the ω's, the function $ag(z^r) - g(z)$ has exactly t_j poles of the same absolute value ω_j (if $u_j \neq 0$), and therefore at least $rt_i - t_j$ $(\geq t_i)$ of the above $\sqrt[r]{\alpha_{i,\nu}}$ are poles of $g(z)$ (assuming $\sqrt[r]{\omega_i} = \omega_j$). Let these be $q_1, \dots, q_v$ with $v \geq t_i$. The rv numbers $\sqrt[r]{q_i}$ are poles of $g(z^r)$, and again at least $rv - t_k$ $(\geq t_i)$ of these are poles of $g(z)$. By repeating this conclusion, we get a contradiction. The same argument works if $g(z)$ has poles of absolute value < 1 (but note that 0 is not a pole of $g(z)$). □

We now consider some special functions of the above type, namely

$$\gamma_\mu(a, z) := \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} a^h z^{\mu r^h} \quad (\mu = 1, \dots, r-1), \tag{8}$$

$$\varphi_\ell(a, z) := \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} a^h \frac{z^{r^h}}{z^{2r^h} - \alpha_\ell}, \quad \lambda_\ell(a, z) = \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} a^h \frac{z^{r^h}}{z^{2r^h} - \beta_\ell} \quad (\ell \in \mathbb{Z}), \tag{9}$$

where a and all α_ℓ, β_ℓ are non-zero complex numbers. These functions satisfy the following functional equations

$$\begin{gathered} a\gamma_\mu(a,z^r) = \gamma_\mu(a,z) - z^\mu, \;\; a\varphi_\ell(a,z^r) = \varphi_\ell(a,z) - \frac{z}{z^2-\alpha_\ell}, \\ a\lambda_\ell(a,z^r) = \lambda_\ell(a,z) - \frac{z}{z^2-\beta_\ell}. \end{gathered} \tag{10}$$

Lemma 2. *Suppose $|\alpha_0| = 1, |\alpha_{\ell_1}| \neq |\alpha_{\ell_2}|$ for $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2$, and $\beta_\ell = \delta_\ell \alpha_\ell$ with $|\delta_\ell| = 1, \delta_\ell \neq 1$ for any $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $p_1, \ldots, p_{r-1}$ and, for some non-negative integer L, the u_ℓ, v_ℓ with $|\ell| \leq L$ are complex numbers, then the function*

$$\sum_{\mu=1}^{r-1} p_\mu \gamma_\mu(a,z) + \sum_{\ell=-L}^{L} \Big(u_\ell \varphi_\ell(a,z) + v_\ell \lambda_\ell(a,z) \Big) \tag{11}$$

is rational if and only if $u_\ell = v_\ell = 0$ for any $\ell \neq 0$, and the following function is rational

$$\sum_{\mu=1}^{r-1} p_\mu \gamma_\mu(a,z) + u_0 \varphi_0(a,z) + v_0 \lambda_0(a,z). \tag{12}$$

Proof. If $g(z)$ denotes the function (11), then

$$ag(z^r) = g(z) - A(z) - \sum_{\ell=-L}^{L} \Big(u_\ell \frac{z}{z^2-\alpha_\ell} + v_\ell \frac{z}{z^2-\beta_\ell} \Big) \tag{13}$$

holds, by (10), with $A(z) := \sum_{\mu=1}^{r-1} p_\mu z^\mu$. Assume now that $g(z)$ is rational.

We begin with the case $r \geq 3$, where we intend to apply Lemma 1. Consider the integers ℓ with $0 < |\ell| \leq L$. If $u_\ell v_\ell = 0$ holds for such an ℓ but $(u_\ell, v_\ell) \neq (0,0)$, then the corresponding t_ℓ in the sense of Lemma 1 equals 2. If, on the other hand, $u_\ell v_\ell \neq 0$, then the contribution

$$u_\ell \frac{z}{z^2-\alpha_\ell} + v_\ell \frac{z}{z^2-\beta_\ell} = \frac{P_\ell(z)}{(z^2-\alpha_\ell)(z^2-\beta_\ell)} \;\text{ with }\; P_\ell(z) := z\big((u_\ell+v_\ell)z^2 - (u_\ell\beta_\ell + v_\ell\alpha_\ell)\big)$$

to the sum in (13) has coprime non-zero $P_\ell(z), (z^2-\alpha_\ell)(z^2-\beta_\ell)$, whence the corresponding t_ℓ is 4. With these two possibilities for the t's in Lemma 1, we see that the condition $(r-1)t_i \geq t_j$ imposed there is satisfied, by $r \geq 3$. Thus, Lemma 1 implies Lemma 2 in this case.

We are left with the case $r = 2$. Suppose that there exists some ℓ, $0 < |\ell| \leq L$, with $(u_\ell, v_\ell) \neq (0,0)$ and, moreover, $|\alpha_\ell| > 1$. Let $\ell = m$ be the index with smallest $|\alpha_\ell|$ having this property.

Before arguing further, we need the following intermediate claim. If ω with $|\omega| > 1$ is a pole of $g(z)$, then $|\omega| \geq |\alpha_m|$. Assume, on the contrary, that $1 < |\omega| < |\alpha_m|$. Then $\omega_1 := \sqrt{\omega}$ is a pole of $g(z^2)$ and also a pole of $g(z)$, by

$$ag(z^2) = g(z) - p_1 z - \sum_{\ell=-L}^{L} \Big(u_\ell \frac{z}{z^2-\alpha_\ell} + v_\ell \frac{z}{z^2-\beta_\ell} \Big). \tag{14}$$

But then $\omega_2 := \sqrt{\omega_1}$ is a pole of $g(z^2)$, hence a pole of $g(z)$, again by (14). Repeating this argument we get a contradiction proving our claim.

With m defined above, we assume $u_m \neq 0$ (the case $v_m \neq 0$ being similar). As we saw, $g(z)$ is polefree in the circular annulus $1 < |z| < |\alpha_m|$. Hence, by (14), the function

$$h(z) := ag(z^2) + \frac{u_m z}{z^2 - \alpha_m}$$

is holomorphic in our annulus from which we have removed the points $\sqrt{\beta_m}$ and $-\sqrt{\beta_m}$ (if $v_m \neq 0$), and the points $\pm\sqrt{\alpha_\ell}, \pm\sqrt{\beta_\ell}$ ($\ell \neq m$) if these points lie in the annulus. Letting now $z \to \sqrt{\alpha_m}$ (or $z \to -\sqrt{\alpha_m}$), one sees from the definition of $h(z)$ that $g(z)$ must have a pole at α_m. Assume that $b(z - \alpha_m)^{-k} + \cdots$ with $b \neq 0$ and a positive integer k indicates the beginning of the Laurent expansion of $g(z)$ at α_m, we find

$$h(z) = \Big(\frac{ab}{(z^2 - \alpha_m)^k} + \cdots\Big) + \frac{u_m z}{z^2 - \alpha_m}$$

near $\sqrt{\alpha_m}$ and $-\sqrt{\alpha_m}$. Thus, we obtain $k = 1$ and $h(z) = (ab + u_m z)/(z^2 - \alpha_m) + \cdots$, hence $ab + u_m\sqrt{\alpha_m} = 0$ and $ab - u_m\sqrt{\alpha_m} = 0$ leading to $u_m = 0$, a contradiction. Thus, Lemma 2 is proved if there exists some $\ell, 0 < |\ell| \leq L$, with $(u_\ell, v_\ell) \neq (0,0)$ and $|\alpha_\ell| > 1$. If, for all $\ell, 0 < |\ell| \leq L$, with $(u_\ell, v_\ell) \neq (0,0)$, the inequality $|\alpha_\ell| < 1$ holds, the proof is similar. □

Remark 1. If we assume that $|\alpha_0| = 1, |\alpha_{\ell_1}| \neq |\alpha_{\ell_2}|$ and $|\beta_{\ell_1}| \neq |\beta_{\ell_2}|$ for $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2$, and $|\alpha_{\ell_1}| \neq |\beta_{\ell_2}|$ for all ℓ_1, ℓ_2, then we see, as at the beginning of the above proof of Lemma 2, that the function $g(z)$ in (11) is rational if and only if $v_0 = 0, u_\ell = v_\ell = 0$ for all $\ell \neq 0$, and the following function is rational

$$\sum_{\mu=1}^{r-1} p_\mu \gamma_\mu(a, z) + u_0 \varphi_0(a, z). \tag{15}$$

The subsequent Lemma 3 concerns just the question in which cases the function (12) can be rational.

Lemma 3. *Suppose $|\alpha_0| = 1$ and $\beta_0 = \delta_0\alpha_0$ with $|\delta_0| = 1, \delta_0 \neq 1$. Suppose that $p_1, \ldots, p_{r-1}, u_0, v_0$ are complex numbers, not all zero, and let $g_0(z)$ denote the function (12). If either $r \geq 4$, or $r = 3$ and $a^2 \neq 9$, then $g_0(z)$ is not rational. If $r = 2$ and $a^2 \neq 2, 4$, then this function is rational if and only if $p_1 = 0$ and, moreover, one of the following six conditions holds, ζ denoting $e^{\pi i/3}$:*
1) $a = 1, \alpha_0 = 1, v_0 = 0$;
2) $a = 1, \beta_0 = 1, u_0 = 0$;
3,4) $a = \pm 1, \alpha_0 = \zeta^2, \beta_0 = \zeta^4, v_0 = -au_0\zeta$;
5,6) $a = \pm 1, \alpha_0 = \zeta^4, \beta_0 = \zeta^2, u_0 = -av_0\zeta$.

Remark 2. In case 1), $\varphi_0(1, z)$ is the rational function $z/(z - 1)$, and in case 2), $\lambda_0(1, z)$ is this same function. In case 3),

$$\zeta^{-2}\varphi_0(1, z) + \zeta^2\lambda_0(1, z) = \frac{2z^2 + z}{z^2 + z + 1}$$

holds, and in case 5), the roles of $\varphi_0(1, z)$ and $\lambda_0(1, z)$ are reversed. In case 4),

$$\frac{1}{1 + \zeta}\varphi_0(-1, z) + \frac{\zeta}{1 + \zeta}\lambda_0(-1, z) = \frac{z}{z^2 + z + 1}$$

holds, whereas in case 6), the roles of $\varphi_0(1,z)$ and $\lambda_0(1,z)$ are reversed. But it should be noted that, in all cases concerning $a = 1$, a solution g of (13), (14), or (16) below is only determined up to an arbitrary additive constant.

Proof of Lemma 3. Our function $g_0(z)$ satisfies

$$ag_0(z^r) = g_0(z) - A(z) - u_0\frac{z}{z^2-\alpha_0} - v_0\frac{z}{z^2-\beta_0}, \tag{16}$$

where $A(z)$ is the polynomial from the beginning of the proof of Lemma 2.

We first show: If $(u_0, v_0) = (0,0)$ (implying $A(z) \neq 0$), then $g_0(z)$ is not rational. Assuming, on the contrary, that $g_0(z) = U(z)/V(z)$ with coprime $U(z), V(z) \in \mathbb{C}[z]\setminus\{0\}$, we have

$$aU(z^r)V(z) = \big(U(z) - A(z)V(z)\big)V(z^r)$$

hence $V(z^r)|V(z)$, and therefore $\deg V = 0$, whence $g_0(z)$ is a non-constant polynomial with $G := \deg g_0$ (≥ 1), say. Hence $\deg(ag_0(z^r) = Gr, \deg(g_0(z) - A(z)) \leq \max(G, r-1)$ giving the desired contradiction. (Note here: If g_0 would be constant, then A as well, by (16) with $(u_0, v_0) = (0,0)$.)

Assume now that $u_0 \neq 0$ and $v_0 = 0$, the case $v_0 \neq 0, u_0 = 0$ being similar. Clearly, all poles ω of $g_0(z)$ satisfy $|\omega| = 1$, and $rt \leq t+2$ or $t \leq 2/(r-1)$, where t denotes the number of distinct poles. Thus, we have a contradiction if $r \geq 4$. If $r = 3$, then [2, Lemma 2] gives a contradiction. In case $r = 2$, [2, Lemma 3] implies that the only possibility is $p_1 = 0, a = \alpha_0 = 1$ and, in this case, $\varphi_0(1,z)$ is the rational function we already saw in Remark 2.

Next, let us assume that $u_0 v_0 \neq 0$. This time we get the upper bound $t \leq 4/(r-1)$ for the number of distinct poles of $g_0(z)$. Thus, we need to consider only the values $r = 2, 3, 4$ and 5, and $t \leq 4$ if $r = 2, t \leq 2$ if $r = 3$, and $t = 1$ otherwise. By comparing the arguments of the possible poles on both sides of (16), we immediately get a contradiction if $r = 5$. In case $r = 4$, [2, Lemma 3] gives a contradiction, too.

Assume now $r = 3$. Then $t \leq 2$, and we immediately see that we must have $t = 2$. Let ω_1 and ω_2 be the distinct poles of $g_0(z)$ with arguments $0 \leq \tau_1 < \tau_2 < 2\pi$, respectively. The arguments of the poles on the left-hand side of (16) are $\tau_1/3 + j2\pi/3, \tau_2/3 + j2\pi/3, j = 0, 1, 2$, and the arguments of the possible poles on the right-hand side are $\tau_1, \tau_2, \phi_1/2, \phi_1/2 + \pi, \phi_2/2, \phi_2/2+\pi$, where $\phi_1 = \min(\arg\alpha_0, \arg\beta_0), \phi_2 = \max(\arg\alpha_0, \arg\beta_0), 0 \leq \phi_1 < \phi_2 < 2\pi$. If $\tau_1 = 0$, then comparision of the arguments of the poles gives us one possibility, where $\phi_1 = 2\pi/3, \phi_2 = 4\pi/3, \tau_1 = 0, \tau_2 = \pi$. By denoting $\zeta = e^{\pi i/3}$, we get $z^3 - 1 = (z-1)(z-\zeta^2)(z-\zeta^4), z^3+1 = (z+1)(z-\zeta)(z-\zeta^5), z^2-\alpha_0 = (z-\zeta)(z-\zeta^4), z^2-\beta_0 = (z-\zeta^2)(z-\zeta^5)$, where we assumed (w.l.o.g.) $\phi_1 = \arg\alpha_0, \phi_2 = \arg\beta_0$. Therefore $g_0(z)$ in (16) takes the shape $g_0(z) = P(z)/(z^2-1)$, where $P(\pm 1) \neq 0$, and we get

$$aP(z^3) = P(z)(z^4+z^2+1) - A(z)(z^6-1) - u_0 z(z^2-1)(z^2-\zeta^4) - v_0 z(z^2-1)(z^2-\zeta^2).$$

This yields $aP(1) = 3P(1)$, and since $P(1) \neq 0$, this contradicts our assumption $a \neq 3$.

In the case $\tau_1 > 0$, we have also one possibility, $\phi_1 = \pi/3, \phi_2 = 5\pi/3, \tau_1 = \pi/2, \tau_2 = 3\pi/2$. Thus $g_0(z) = P(z)/(z^2+1)$, where $P(\pm i) \neq 0$. By (16),

$$aP(z^3) = P(z)(z^4-z^2+1) - A(z)(z^6+1) - u_0 z(z^2+1)(z^2-\zeta^5) - v_0 z(z^2+1)(z^2-\zeta).$$

Thus, $a^2P(i) = 3aP(-i) = 9P(i)$ giving $a^2 = 9$, which contradicts our assumptions.

We are left with the case $r = 2$, $t \leq 4$ as noticed above. We assume firstly that none of α_0, β_0 is equal to 1.

Let $t = 4$ and ω_j with $0 \leq \tau_j = \arg\omega_j < 2\pi$ $(j = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ be the poles. W.l.o.g. we may assume that $0 \leq \tau_1 < \tau_2 < \tau_3 < \tau_4 < 2\pi$ and $0 < \phi_1 = \arg\alpha_0 < \phi_2 = \arg\beta_0 < 2\pi$. Comparing the arguments on both sides of (16) gives $\tau_4 = \phi_2$. If $\tau_1 = 0$, then we must have $\tau_2 = \phi_1$ and $\{\tau_3/2, \pi, \tau_3/2+\pi\} = \{\phi_1,\ \tau_3,\ \phi_2\}$. This means that $\tau_3 = \pi, \phi_1 = \pi/2, \phi_2 = 3\pi/2$, and $\omega_1 = 1, \omega_2 = \alpha_0 = i, \omega_3 = -1, \omega_4 = \beta_0 = -i$. Thus, $g_0(z) = P(z)/(z^4 - 1)$, where $P(z)$ is a polynomial satisfying $P(\pm1)P(\pm i) \neq 0$. Now (16) gives

$$aP(z^2) = P(z)(z^4 + 1) - p_1z(z^4 - 1)(z^4 + 1) - u_0z(z^4 - 1)(z^2 + i) - v_0z(z^4 - 1)(z^2 - i),$$

hence $aP(1) = 2P(1)$, and so $a = 2$, contrary to our assumptions. In the case $\tau_1 > 0$, we must have $\tau_1 = \phi_1$ and $\{\tau_2/2, \tau_3/2, \tau_2/2 + \pi, \tau_3/2 + \pi\} = \{\phi_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \phi_2\}$. We therefore have $\tau_2 = 2\phi_1, \tau_3 = 4\phi_1, \phi_1 + \pi = 4\phi_1$ or $\phi_1 = \pi/3$, and finally $\phi_2 = 5\pi/3$. By denoting $\zeta = e^{\pi i/3}$ as above, we have $\omega_1 = \alpha_0 = \zeta, \omega_2 = \zeta^2, \omega_3 = \zeta^4, \omega_4 = \beta_0 = \zeta^5$. As before, we now have

$$aP(z^2) = P(z)(z^2-\zeta)(z^2+\zeta^2)-p_1z(z^4-\zeta^2)(z^4-\zeta^4)-u_0z(z^2+\zeta)(z^4-\zeta^4)-v_0z(z^4-\zeta^2)(z^2-\zeta^2),$$

where $P(z)$ satisfies $P(\pm\zeta)P(\pm\zeta^2) \neq 0$. On substituting $z = -\zeta$ and $z = \zeta^2$ to the last equation, we are led to

$$aP(\zeta^2) = -2\zeta^2P(-\zeta) \text{ and } aP(-\zeta) = 2\zeta P(\zeta^2),$$

respectively, implying $a^2 = 4$ but again this contradicts our assumptions.

Let now $t = 3$. Comparing the arguments of the poles gives here four possibilities: 1) $\omega_1 = 1, \omega_2 = \alpha_0 = i, \omega_3 = \beta_0 = -1$; 2) $\omega_1 = 1, \omega_2 = \alpha_0 = -1, \omega_3 = \beta_0 = -i$; 3) $\omega_1 = \alpha_0 = \zeta, \omega_2 = \zeta^2, \omega_3 = \beta_0 = \zeta^4$; 4) $\omega_1 = \alpha_0 = \zeta^2, \omega_2 = \zeta^4, \omega_3 = \beta_0 = \zeta^5$.

In case 1), we apply (16) and obtain

$$aP(z^2) = P(z)(z + i)(z^2 - i) - p_1z(z^4 - 1)(z^2 - i) - u_0z(z^4 - 1) - v_0z(z^2 - 1)(z^2 - i)$$

with some polynomial $P(z)$ satisfying $P(\pm1)P(i) \neq 0$. Therefore $aP(1) = 2P(1)$ and $a = 2$. In case 2), we get the same contradiction to our assumptions.

Using (16) we get in case 3)

$$aP(z^2) = P(z)(z^2-\zeta)(z+\zeta^2)-p_1z(z^4-\zeta^2)(z^2-\zeta^2)-u_0z(z^2-\zeta^2)(z^2+\zeta)-v_0z(z^2-\zeta)(z^2-\zeta^2),$$

where $P(z)$ satisfies $P(\pm\zeta)P(\zeta^2) \neq 0$. Taking here $z = \zeta^2$ and $z = -\zeta^2$ we obtain

$$aP(-\zeta) = 4P(\zeta^2) + 2v_0\zeta(\zeta + 1) \text{ and } aP(-\zeta) = -2v_0\zeta(\zeta + 1),$$

respectively, hence $aP(-\zeta) = 2P(\zeta^2)$. Inserting, moreover, $z = -\zeta$ we find $aP(\zeta^2) = P(-\zeta)$, and the last two equations lead to $a^2 = 2$, contrary to our assumptions. Case 4) can be similarly dealt with.

Assume finally $t = 2$. In this case, a reasoning as above implies one possibility, namely $\omega_1 = \alpha_0 = \zeta^2, \omega_2 = \beta_0 = \zeta^4$. By using (16), we therefore get

$$aP(z^2) = P(z)(z-\zeta)(z+\zeta^2) - p_1 z(z^2-\zeta^2)(z^2-\zeta^4) - u_0 z(z^2-\zeta^4) - v_0 z(z^2-\zeta^2), \tag{17}$$

where $P(z)$ satisfies $P(\zeta^2)P(\zeta^4) \neq 0$. For $z = \zeta$ and $z = -\zeta^2$, we get $aP(\zeta^2) = -u_0\zeta^2(1+\zeta)$ and $aP(\zeta^4) = v_0(1+\zeta)$, respectively. Thus, applying (17) with $z = \zeta^2$ and $z = -\zeta$, we find after some minor computation

$$aP(\zeta^4) = -\zeta^2 P(\zeta^2) \text{ and } aP(\zeta^2) = \zeta P(\zeta^4),$$

respectively. This gives immediately $a^2 = 1$ hence $a = \pm 1$.

If $a = -1$, then the above implies $u_0\zeta^2(1+\zeta) = P(\zeta^2) = -\zeta P(\zeta^4) = v_0\zeta(1+\zeta)$. Thus, $v_0 = u_0\zeta$ and (17) gives

$$-P(z^2) = P(z)(z^2 - z + 1) - p_1 z(z^2-\zeta^2)(z^2-\zeta^4) - u_0(z(z^2-\zeta^4) + \zeta z(z^2-\zeta^2)).$$

From this equation, we deduce $\deg P(z) \leq 2$, say $P(z) = P_1 z + P_2 z^2$, and $p_1 = 0$. Then the above equation leads to $P_1 = u_0(1+\zeta), P_2 = 0$, and the rational function

$$g_0(z) = u_0(1+\zeta)\frac{z}{z^2+z+1} = u_0\varphi_0(-1,z) + u_0\zeta\lambda_0(-1,z)$$

satisfies (16) in this case.

In case $a = 1$, we have $-u_0\zeta^2(1+\zeta) = P(\zeta^2) = \zeta P(\zeta^4) = v_0\zeta(1+\zeta)$ giving $v_0 = -u_0\zeta$. By (17),

$$P(z^2) = P(z)(z^2 - z + 1)) - p_1 z(z^2-\zeta^2)(z^2-\zeta^4) - u_0(z(z^2-\zeta^4) - \zeta z(z^2-\zeta^2)).$$

Again we are led to $\deg P(z) \leq 2$ and $p_1 = 0$. By substituting $P(z) = P_1 z + P_2 z^2$ to the above equation, we obtain $P_1 = -u_0(1-\zeta), P_2 = 2P_1$. (Note here that, in virtue of our concluding statement in Remark 2, we are allowed to assume $P(0) = 0$, w.l.o.g.) Thus, in this case, (16) has a rational solution

$$g_0(z) = u_0(\zeta-1)\frac{2z^2+z}{z^2+z+1} = u_0\varphi_0(1,z) - u_0\zeta\lambda_0(1,z).$$

We still have to consider the case $\alpha_0 = 1$. Now the cases $t = 3$ or $t = 4$ are clearly not possible, and $t = 2$ is only possible if $\omega_1 = 1, \omega_2 = \beta_0 = -1$. By (16),

$$aP(z^2) = P(z)(z^2+1) - p_1 z(z^2-1)(z^2+1) - u_0 z(z^2+1) - v_0 z(z^2-1)$$

with some polynomial $P(z)$ satisfying $P(\pm 1) \neq 0$. Therefore $aP(-1) = 2iv_0$ and $aP(-1) = -2iv_0$ giving $P(-1) = 0$, a contradiction.

Thus, the condition $u_0 v_0 \neq 0$ holds exactly in cases 3)-6), and this completes the proof of Lemma 3. □

Remark 3. From the beginning of the above proof it follows that, under the assumptions of Remark 1, the function (15) is rational if and only if $r = 2, p_1 = 0, a = \alpha_0 = 1$ and, in this case, $\varphi_0(1,z)$ is rational.

3 Algebraic independence of functions

For a sequence $(a_h)_{h\geq 0}$ of complex numbers, we denote by $(a_h^{(j)})_{h\geq 0}, j \in \mathbb{N}$, the sequences

$$(a_h^{(1)}) = (a_0, a_1, \ldots), (a_h^{(2)}) = (a_0, 0, a_1, 0, a_2, 0, \ldots), (a_h^{(3)}) = (a_0, 0, 0, a_1, 0, 0, a_2, 0, 0 \ldots), \ldots.$$

By [9, Lemmas 2.7 and 2.8], these sequences have the following properties:

a) *If $(a_h)_{h\geq 0}$ is a periodic sequence, not identically zero, then the sequences $(a_h^{(j)})_{h\geq 0}$ $(j \geq 1)$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{C}$.*

b) *If $(a_h)_{h\geq 0}$ is a periodic sequence with period length greater than 1, then $(1), (a_h^{(j)})_{h\geq 0}$ $(j \geq 1)$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{C}$, (1) being the obvious constant sequence.*

The following lemma will be needed (see [9, p.106]).

Lemma 4. *Let p be a positive integer, $(B_h)_{h\geq 0}$ a periodic sequence with period lenght dividing p, and let $R(z)$ be the quotient of two polynomials in $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_n)$ such that the numerator vanishes at the origin of $\mathbb{C}^n$ but the denominator does not. Further, define*

$$f_r(z) = \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} B_h R(z^{r^h}).$$

Then, for any $s \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$f_{r^j}(z^{r^{s!p}}) = f_{r^j}(z) + R_{r,j}(z)$$

holds for $j = 1, \ldots, s$ with rational functions $R_{r,j}(z)$. (Note here $z^k = (z_1^k, \ldots, z_n^k)$).

Proof. According to the definition of $f_r(z)$, we have $f_{r^j}(z) = \sum_{h\geq 0} B_h R(z^{r^{jh}})$, hence

$$f_{r^j}(z^{r^{s!p}}) = \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} B_h R(z^{r^{j(h+(s!/j)p)}}) = \sum_{\widetilde{h}=(s!/j)p}^{\infty} B_{\widetilde{h}-(s!/j)p} R(z^{r^{j\widetilde{h}}}) = \sum_{\widetilde{h}=\widetilde{h}(j)}^{\infty} B_{\widetilde{h}} R(z^{r^{j\widetilde{h}}})$$

(with $\widetilde{h}(j) := (s!/j)p \in \mathbb{N}$), and this equals $f_{r^j}(z)$ up to a rational function. □

Let now $t_1, t_2, t_3 \in \mathbb{N}$, and suppose

$$q_{k,m}(z) \in \mathbb{C}(z_1, \ldots, z_n) \quad (k = 1, 2, 3;\ m = 1, \ldots, t_k),$$

where the numerators vanish at the origin but the denominators do not. Then we define

$$f_{k,m}(a, z) := \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} a^h q_{k,m}(z^{r^h}) \quad (k = 1, 2, 3;\ m = 1, \ldots, t_k). \tag{18}$$

Further, let $(b_{k,h})_{h\geq 0}$ $(k = 1, 2, 3)$ be non-zero periodic sequences of complex numbers with period lengths p_k, respectively, put $p := \mathrm{lcm}(p_1, p_2, p_3)$, and denote, moreover,

$$f_{k,m,r}(z) := \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} b_{k,h} q_{k,m}(z^{r^h}) \quad (k = 1, 2, 3;\ m = 1, \ldots, t_k). \tag{19}$$

By following ideas of [9, pp.106-107], we can now prove

Lemma 5. *If, for any root of unity ξ, the functions (18) formed with $a = \xi$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{C}$ modulo $\mathbb{C}(z_1, \ldots, z_n)$, then the functions*

$$f_{k,m,r^j}(z) \quad (j \in \mathbb{N};\ k = 1, 2, 3;\ m = 1, \ldots, t_k)$$

are algebraically independent over $\mathbb{C}(z_1, \ldots, z_n)$.

Proof. Assume, on the contrary, that there exists an $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the functions

$$f_{k,m,r^j}(z) \quad (j = 1, \ldots, s;\ k = 1, 2, 3;\ m = 1, \ldots, t_k)$$

are algebraically dependent. By Lemma 4, we may apply [6, Corollary of Theorem 3.2.1], whence these functions are linearly dependent over $\mathbb{C}$ modulo $\mathbb{C}(z_1, \ldots, z_n)$. Thus, there exist complex numbers $a_{k,m,j}$, not all zero, such that

$$G(z) := \sum_{k=1}^{3} \sum_{m=1}^{t_k} \sum_{j=1}^{s} a_{k,m,j} f_{k,m,r^j}(z) \in \mathbb{C}(z_1, \ldots, z_n).$$

Since

$$f_{k,m,r^j}(z) = \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} b_{k,h} q_{k,m}(z^{r^{jh}}) = \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} b_{k,h}^{(j)} q_{k,m}(z^{r^h}),$$

we obtain

$$G(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{3} \sum_{m=1}^{t_k} \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{s} a_{k,m,j} b_{k,h}^{(j)} \Big) q_{k,m}(z^{r^h}).$$

Here all sequences

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{s} a_{k,m,j} b_{k,h}^{(j)} \Big)_{h \geq 0}$$

are periodic with period lengths dividing $s!p$, and therefore there exist complex numbers $A_{k,m,i}$ such that, for all $h \geq 0$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{s} a_{k,m,j} b_{k,h}^{(j)} = \sum_{i=0}^{s!p-1} A_{k,m,i} \omega^{ih} \tag{20}$$

with a primitive $(s!p)$-th root of unity ω. By property a) from the beginning of this section, not all $A_{k,m,i}$ vanish. Thus, $G(z)$ has the form

$$G(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{3} \sum_{m=1}^{t_k} \sum_{i=0}^{s!p-1} A_{k,m,i} f_{k,m}(\omega^i, z) = \sum_{i=0}^{s!p-1} G_i(z) \in \mathbb{C}(z_1, \ldots, z_n), \tag{21}$$

where

$$G_i(z) := \sum_{k=1}^{3} \sum_{m=1}^{t_k} A_{k,m,i} f_{k,m}(\omega^i, z).$$

Here

$$\omega^i G_i(z^r) - G_i(z) \in \mathbb{C}(z_1, \dots, z_n).$$

Let now $J := \{i : 0 \le i \le s!p-1$ and at least one $A_{k,m,i} \ne 0\}$. As noted above J is not empty. By applying again [6, Corollary of Theorem 3.2.1] to the functions $G_i(z), i \in J$, it follows that there exists an $i_0 \in J$ such that $G_{i_0}(z) \in \mathbb{C}(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ (note that the ω^i are distinct). By our hypothesis on linear independence of the $f_{k,m}(\omega^{i_0}, z)$, we get the contradiction that all A_{k,m,i_0} vanish, proving Lemma 5. □

We now apply the above results to the functions of one variable

$$\gamma_{\mu,r}(z) := \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} a_h z^{\mu r^h} \quad (\mu = 1, \dots, r-1), \tag{22}$$

$$\varphi_{\ell,r}(z) := \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} b_h \frac{z^{r^h}}{z^{2r^h} - \alpha_{\ell,r}} \quad (\ell \in \mathbb{Z}, r \in \mathbb{N}, r \ge 2), \tag{23}$$

$$\lambda_{\ell,r}(z) := \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} c_h \frac{z^{r^h}}{z^{2r^h} - \beta_{\ell,r}} \quad (\ell \in \mathbb{Z}, r \in \mathbb{N}, r \ge 2). \tag{24}$$

Lemma 6. *Assume that $\alpha_{\ell,r}$ and $\beta_{\ell,r}$ satisfy the conditions of α_ℓ and β_ℓ in Lemma 2, and let $\alpha_{\ell,r^j} := \alpha_{\ell,r}$ and $\beta_{\ell,r^j} := \beta_{\ell,r}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. If $r \ge 3$, then the functions*

$$\gamma_{\mu,r^j}(z),\ \varphi_{\ell,r^j}(z),\ \lambda_{\ell,r^j}(z) \quad (\mu = 1, \dots, r-1,\ \ell \in \mathbb{Z},\ j \in \mathbb{N}) \tag{25}$$

are algebraically independent over $\mathbb{C}(z)$. If $r = 2$, then the functions (25) are algebraically independent apart from the following cases:
1) (b_h) is constant and $\alpha_{0,2} = 1$;
2) (c_h) is constant and $\beta_{0,2} = 1$;
3) $\alpha_{0,2} = \zeta^2, \beta_{0,2} = \zeta^4$;
4) $\alpha_{0,2} = \zeta^4, \beta_{0,2} = \zeta^2$,
where $\zeta = e^{\pi i/3}$ as in Lemma 3. In the cases 1) and 2), either $\varphi_{0,2}(z) \in \mathbb{C}(z)$, or $\lambda_{0,2}(z) \in \mathbb{C}(z)$, respectively, but all other functions in (25) are algebraically independent over $\mathbb{C}(z)$. In the cases 3) and 4), after removing the functions $\varphi_{0,2^j}(z)$ (or $\lambda_{0,2^j}(z)$) $(j \in \mathbb{N})$ from (25), the remaining functions are algebraically independent over $\mathbb{C}(z)$.

Proof. We suppose that there exist $L, s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the functions

$$\gamma_{\mu,r^j}(z),\ \varphi_{\ell,r^j}(z),\ \lambda_{\ell,r^j}(z) \quad (\mu = 1, \dots, r-1,\ -L \le \ell \le L,\ j = 1, \dots, s)$$

are algebraically dependent, and deduce a contradiction.

We shall use Lemma 5, where $(b_{1,h}) = (a_h), t_1 = r-1$, $(b_{2,h}) = (b_h), t_2 = 2L+1$, $(b_{3,h}) = (c_h), t_3 = 2L+1$. Further, $f_{1,m}(z), f_{2,m}(z), f_{3,m}(z)$ are the functions $\gamma_\mu(a,z)\,(1 \le \mu < r)$, $\varphi_\ell(a,z)$ $(-L \le \ell \le L)$, $\lambda_\ell(a,z)$ $(-L \le \ell \le L)$, respectively, and $f_{1,m,r}(z), f_{2,m,r}(z)$, $f_{3,m,r}(z)$ are the functions $\gamma_{\mu,r}(z)$ $(\mu = 1, \dots, r-1)$, $\varphi_{\ell,r}(z)$ $(-L \le \ell \le L)$, $\lambda_{\ell,r}(z)$ $(-L \le$

$\ell \le L$). If $r \ge 3$, then a contradiction proving Lemma 6 follows immediately from Lemmas 2, 3 and 5. The same holds, if $r = 2$ and $\alpha_{0,2} \ne 1, \beta_{0,2} \ne 1$.

Assume now $r = 2$ and $\alpha_{0,2} = 1$ (the case $\beta_{0,2} = 1$ being similar). Let $f_{2,1}(a, z) = \varphi_{0,1}(a, z)$ and $f_{2,1,2}(z) = \varphi_{0,2}(z)$. We may proceed as in the proof of Lemma 5, but now we assume that the function $f_{2,1,2}(z)$ is omitted if (b_h) is constant, so $a_{2,1,1} = 0$ in this case. Now $f_{2,1}(1, z) = \varphi_{0,1}(1, z) \in \mathbb{C}(z)$, and thus (21) yields

$$G(z) - A_{2,1,0} f_{2,1}(1, z) = \sum_{i=0}^{s!p-1} G_i^*(z) \in \mathbb{C}(z),$$

where $G_i^*(z) = G_i(z)\,(1 \le i \le s!p - 1)$ but $G_0^*(z) = G_0(z) - A_{2,1,0} f_{2,1}(1, z)$. We now define J^* as J in the proof of Lemma 5, but this time $A_{2,1,0}$ is replaced by 0 in this definition (thus we may have $0 \in J$ but $0 \notin J^*$). If J^* is not empty, we get a contradiction as in the proof of Lemma 5. Therefore we now deduce that $A_{k,m,i} = 0$ for all $(k, m, i) \ne (2, 1, 0)$. Thus, $A_{2,1,0} \ne 0$ and, by (20),

$$\sum_{j=1}^{s} a_{2,1,j} b_h^{(j)} = A_{2,1,0} \quad (h \in \mathbb{N}_0).$$

If $(b_h)_{h\ge 0}$ is not constant, then the sequences $(b_h^{(j)})_{h\ge 0}$ $(1 \le j \le s)$ and $(1)_{h\ge 0}$ are linearly dependent contrary to property b) from the beginning of this section. If $(b_h)_{h\ge 0}$ is constant, then $a_{2,1,1} = 0$, and hence $(b_h^{(j)})_{h\ge 0}$ $(2 \le j \le s)$ and $(1)_{h\ge 0}$ are linearly dependent, contrary to property a). Thus, Lemma 6 holds. □

Remark 4. Similarly, by using Remarks 1 and 3, we see that the results of Lemma 6 hold also if α_ℓ and β_ℓ satisfy the conditions of Remark 1. Here the cases 3) and 4) do not occur.

4 Proof of Theorem 3

Assume, contrary to Theorem 3, that the numbers (6) are algebraically dependent. Then there exist a finite set $\mathcal{R}_0 \subset \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ and a positive integer L_0 such that the numbers

$$\Gamma_{\mu,r}(\alpha),\ \Phi_{\ell,r}(\alpha),\ \Lambda_{\ell,r}(\alpha) \quad (-L_0 \le \ell \le L_0,\ r \in \mathcal{R}_0,\ \mu = 1, \dots, d(r) - 1)$$

are algebraically dependent (in the exceptional cases, the numbers mentioned there are removed). We shall prove that this is impossible.

From definition (2) of $\mathcal{D}$, it follows that $\mathbb{N}\setminus\{1\} = \{d^j : d \in \mathcal{D}, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\log d_1/\log d_2 \notin \mathbb{Q}$ for all distinct $d_1, d_2 \in \mathcal{D}$, see [9, p.105]. Thus, there exist a finite subset $\mathcal{D}_0 \subset \mathcal{D}$ and a positive integer s such that $\mathcal{R}_0 \subset \{d^j : d \in \mathcal{D}_0, j = 1, \dots, s\}$.

Let L be a positive integer. Assume that, for each $d \in \mathcal{D}_0$, we have non-zero algebraic numbers $\alpha_{\ell,d}, \beta_{\ell,d}$ $(-L \le \ell \le L)$ as in Lemma 6 above. If α is an algebraic number with $0 < |\alpha| < 1$, then we may choose an $h_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ in such a way that $|\alpha|^{2^{h_0}} < \min(|\alpha_{\ell,d}|, |\beta_{\ell,d}| : -L \le \ell \le L, d \in \mathcal{D}_0)$. If the functions

$$\widetilde{\gamma}_{\mu,d}(z),\ \widetilde{\varphi}_{\ell,d}(z),\ \widetilde{\lambda}_{\ell,d}(z)$$

are defined as in (22)-(24) above, but now with summation starting from h_0, then all numbers

$$\widetilde{\gamma}_{\mu,d^j}(\alpha),\ \widetilde{\varphi}_{\ell,d^j}(\alpha),\ \widetilde{\lambda}_{\ell,d^j}(\alpha) \quad (-L \le \ell \le L,\ d \in \mathcal{D}_0,\ \mu = 1,\dots,d-1,\ j = 1,\dots,s) \tag{26}$$

are defined. For these numbers we have the following

Lemma 7. *Let $\alpha_{\ell,d}$ and $\beta_{\ell,d}$ satisfy the conditions of Lemma 6. Then the numbers (26) are algebraically independent, unless $2 \in \mathcal{D}_0$ and one of the following cases hold:*
1) (b_h) is constant and $\alpha_{0,2} = 1$;
2) (c_h) is constant and $\beta_{0,2} = 1$;
3) $\alpha_{0,2} = \zeta^2, \beta_{0,2} = \zeta^4$;
4) $\alpha_{0,2} = \zeta^4, \beta_{0,2} = \zeta^2$.
In the cases 1) and 2), either $\widetilde{\varphi}_{0,2}(\alpha)$ or $\widetilde{\lambda}_{0,2}(\alpha)$, respectively, is algebraic, but all other numbers in (26) are algebraically independent. In the cases 3) and 4), after removing the numbers $\widetilde{\varphi}_{0,2^j}(\alpha)$ (or $\widetilde{\lambda}_{0,2^j}(\alpha)$) $(j = 1,\dots,s)$ from (26), the remaining numbers are algebraically independent.

Proof. We apply Lemma 4 to the functions

$$\widetilde{\gamma}_{\mu,d^j}(z),\ \widetilde{\varphi}_{\ell,d^j}(z),\ \widetilde{\lambda}_{\ell,d^j}(z) \quad (-L \le \ell \le L,\ d \in \mathcal{D}_0,\ \mu = 1,\dots,d-1,\ j = 1,\dots,s).$$

(In the exceptional cases 1) and 2), either $\widetilde{\varphi}_{0,2}(z)$ or $\widetilde{\lambda}_{0,2}(z)$, respectively, is removed. In the cases 3) and 4), $\widetilde{\varphi}_{0,2^j}(z)$ (or $\widetilde{\lambda}_{0,2^j}(z)$) $(j = 1,\dots,s)$ are removed.) This gives a system of functional equations of the type used in [9, Lemma 2.1]. Further, $\log d_i^{s!p}/\log d_k^{s!p} \notin \mathbb{Q}$ holds for all distinct $d_i, d_k \in \mathcal{D}_0$. Therefore, by [9, Lemma 2.1], to prove Lemma 7, it suffices to show that, for given $d \in \mathcal{D}_0$, the functions

$$\widetilde{\gamma}_{\mu,d^j}(z),\ \widetilde{\varphi}_{\ell,d^j}(z),\ \widetilde{\lambda}_{\ell,d^j}(z) \quad (-L \le \ell \le L,\ \mu = 1,\dots,d-1,\ j = 1,\dots,s)$$

are algebraically independent over $\mathbb{C}(z)$. Therefore Lemma 6 immediately implies Lemma 7. □

Remark 5. By using Remark 4, we similarly get the validity of Lemma 7 if the hypotheses of Remark 1 are satisfied.

By choosing $L = L_0$ and using Lemma 7, we see that the assumption from the beginning of this section leads to a contradiction. This proves Theorem 3.

5 Proof of Theorems 1 and 2

It is enough to prove Theorem 2 since Theorem 1 is a consequence of it. We first note that, by using the definition of R_n and S_n, we get

$$R_{kr^h+\ell} = E_{\ell,r}\gamma_1^{kr^h}(\gamma_1^{-2kr^h} - e_{\ell,r}),\ E_{\ell,r} = \delta^{kr}g_2\gamma_2^{\ell},\ e_{\ell,r} = -\delta^{kr+\ell}g_1g_2^{-1}\gamma_1^{2\ell}, \tag{27}$$

$$S_{kr^h+\ell} = F_{\ell,r}\gamma_1^{kr^h}(\gamma_1^{-2kr^h} - f_{\ell,r}),\ F_{\ell,r} = \delta^{kr}h_2\gamma_2^{\ell},\ f_{\ell,r} = -\delta^{kr+\ell}h_1h_2^{-1}\gamma_1^{2\ell}. \tag{28}$$

Here $e_{\ell,r^j}, f_{\ell,r^j}, E_{\ell,r^j}$ and F_{ℓ,r^j} $(j \in \mathbb{N})$ do not depend on j, and $|e_{\ell,r}|$ and $|f_{\ell,r}|$ do not depend on r. We first consider the case $\Omega = \Delta(\gamma_1/\gamma_2)^{\ell_1} = \Delta\delta^{\ell_1}\gamma_1^{2\ell_1}, |\Delta| = 1, \Delta \neq 1$, which means that $e_{\ell,r} = \Delta f_{\ell_1+\ell,r}, |e_{\ell,r}| = |f_{\ell_1+\ell,r}|$ for all ℓ, r.

Remark 6. The hypothesis $\Delta \neq 1$ in Theorem 2 is needed since otherwise $h_2\gamma_2^{\ell_1}R_{kr^h+\ell} = g_2S_{kr^h+\ell+\ell_1}$ for all h, ℓ. If $(b_h) = (c_h) = (1)$, for example, this gives a dependence relation $g_2R_{\ell,r} = h_2\gamma_2^{\ell_1}S_{\ell+\ell_1,r}$.

Assume now that the numbers (5) are algebraically dependent. Then there exist a finite set $\mathcal{R}_0 \subset \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ and a positive integer L_0 such that the numbers

$$Q_{\mu,r},\ R_{\ell,r},\ S_{\ell,r} \quad (-L_0 \le \ell \le L_0,\ r \in \mathcal{R}_0,\ \mu = 1, \dots, d(r)-1)$$

are algebraically dependent (in the exceptional cases we remove the numbers mentioned in Theorem 2). As in the last section, there exist a finite subset $\mathcal{D}_0 \subset \mathcal{D}$ and a positive integer s such that $\mathcal{R}_0 \subset \{d^j : d \in \mathcal{D}_0, j = 1, \dots, s\}$.

Let $\alpha_{\ell,r} := e_{\ell_0+\ell,r}$, $\beta_{\ell,r} := f_{\ell_1+\ell_0+\ell,r}$ for $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ if there exists some ℓ_0 with $|e_{\ell_0,r}| = 1$; otherwise we choose $\ell_0 = 0$. Let $L = L_0 + |\ell_1| + |\ell_0|$, and choose h_0 such that

$$|\gamma_1|^{-k2^{h_0}} < \min(|\alpha_{-L,r}|, |\beta_{-L,r}|).$$

According to Lemma 7, the numbers

$$\widetilde{\gamma}_{\mu,d^j}(\gamma_1^{-k}),\ \widetilde{\varphi}_{\ell,d^j}(\gamma_1^{-k}),\ \widetilde{\lambda}_{\ell,d^j}(\gamma_1^{-k}) \quad (-L \le \ell \le L,\ d \in \mathcal{D}_0,\ \mu = 1, \dots, d-1,\ j = 1, \dots, s)$$

are algebraically independent. (In the exceptional cases 1), 2), and 3,4), the numbers $\widetilde{\varphi}_{0,2}(\gamma_1^{-k})$, $\widetilde{\lambda}_{0,2}(\gamma_1^{-k})$ and $\widetilde{\varphi}_{0,2^j}(\gamma_1^{-k})$ $(j = 1, \dots, s)$, respectively, are removed.) Since, by (27) and (28), for any $r = d^j$,

$$Q_{\mu,r} - \sum_{h=0}^{h_0-1} \frac{a_h}{\gamma_1^{k\mu r^h}} = \widetilde{\gamma}_{1,r}(\gamma_1^{-k}),$$

$$R_{\ell,r} - \sum_{h=0}^{h_0-1}{}' \frac{b_h}{R_{kr^h+\ell}} = E_{\ell,r}\widetilde{\varphi}_{\ell-\ell_0,r}(\gamma_1^{-k}),$$

$$S_{\ell,r} - \sum_{h=0}^{h_0-1}{}' \frac{c_h}{S_{kr^h+\ell}} = F_{\ell,r}\widetilde{\lambda}_{\ell-\ell_1-\ell_0,r}(\gamma_1^{-k}),$$

we get a contradiction to the assumption on algebraic dependence above. Furthermore, note that the condition $R_{\ell_0} = 0$ (or $S_{\ell_1+\ell_0} = 0$) is equivalent to $\alpha_{0,2} = e_{\ell_0,2} = 1$ (or $\beta_{0,2} = f_{\ell_1+\ell_0,2} = 1$), and the conditions in 3,4) mean that $\alpha_{0,2} = e^{2\pi i/3}$ or $e^{4\pi i/3}$ and $\beta_{0,2} = \alpha_{0,2}^2$.

If $|\Omega| \notin |\gamma_1/\gamma_2|^{\mathbb{Z}}$, then $|e_{\ell_1,r}| \neq |f_{\ell_2,r}|$ for all ℓ_1, ℓ_2. Thus, the above deduction works also in this case, by Remark 5. This proves Theorem 2. □

References

[1] P.-G. Becker and T. Töpfer, Transcendency results for sums of reciprocals of linear recurrences, *Math. Nachr.* **168** (1994) 5-17.

[2] P. Bundschuh and K. Väänänen, Algebraic independence of certain Mahler functions and of their values (submitted).

[3] P. Bundschuh and K. Väänänen, Some arithmetical results on reciprocal sums of certain Fibonacci-type numbers (submitted).

[4] D. Duverney, T. Kanoko, and T. Tanaka, Transcendence of certain reciprocal sums of linear recurrences, *Monatsh. Math.* **137** (2002) 115-128.

[5] T. Kanoko, T. Kurosawa, and I. Shiokawa, Transcendence of reciprocal sums of binary recurrences, *Monatsh. Math.* **157** (2009) 323-334.

[6] K. Nishioka, *Mahler Functions and Transcendence*, LNM 1631 (Springer, Berlin et al., 1996).

[7] K. Nishioka, Algebraic independence of reciprocal sums of binary recurrences, *Monatsh. Math.* **123** (1997) 135-148.

[8] K. Nishioka, Algebraic independence of reciprocal sums of binary recurrences II, *Monatsh. Math.* **136** (2002) 123-141.

[9] K. Nishioka, T. Tanaka, and T. Toshimitsu, Algebraic independence of sums of reciprocals of the Fibonacci numbers, *Math. Nachr.* **202** (1999) 97-108.

Authors' addresses:

Peter Bundschuh
Mathematisches Institut
Universität zu Köln
Weyertal 86-90
50931 Köln, Germany
E-mail: pb@math.uni-koeln.de

Keijo Väänänen
Department of Mathematical Sciences
University of Oulu
P. O. Box 3000
90014 Oulu, Finland
E-mail: kvaanane@sun3.oulu.fi